From: "Blair Taylor" <btaylor@memphistomorrow.org>
To: "Angela Madden (acrews1)" <acrews1@memphis.edu>
"William Gibbons \(wgibbons\)" <wgibbons@memphis.edu>
"Brona Pinnolis" <bpinnolis@memphiscrime.org>
"Weirich, Amy" <Amy.Weirich@scdag.com>
wgiibbons@memphis.edu
"Mike Gates" <Mike.Gates@shelbycountytn.gov>
kevin.woods@workforceinvestmentnetwork.com
Mike.Shearin@memphistn.gov
Julie.Nations@memphistn.gov
Date: 6/13/2017 11:55:35 AM
Subject: RE: Very convincing rationale for using randomized controlled trials

---

Great info! Thanks for sharing!

Blair Taylor
President
Memphis Tomorrow
22 North Front Street, Suite 670
Memphis, TN 38103
Office: 901.322.8080
btaylor@memphistomorrow.org

From: Angela Madden (acrews1) [mailto:acrews1@memphis.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, June 13, 2017 10:47 AM
To: William Gibbons (wgibbons) <wgibbons@memphis.edu>; Brona Pinnolis <bpinnolis@memphiscrime.org>; Weirich, Amy <Amy.Weirich@scdag.com>; wgiibbons@memphis.edu; Mike Gates <Mike.Gates@shelbycountytn.gov>; kevin.woods@workforceinvestmentnetwork.com; Blair Taylor <btaylor@memphistomorrow.org>; Mike.Shearin@memphistn.gov; Julie.Nations@memphistn.gov
Subject: Very convincing rationale for using randomized controlled trials

Morning all!

Very interesting class this morning from a Harvard economist illustrating why randomized controlled trials are the best way to determine program impact. I think that some of this material could prove helpful to various agencies in our area who are implementing programs and whose funders want evidence of program impact (or government agencies accountable to taxpayers). Perhaps a symposium topic in the future?

This table compares results using 6 different methodological techniques to determine the impact of a "get out the vote" phone call campaign on voting behavior (voting in 1998 compared to voting in 2002).

The "Pre-Post" method below simply compares the % of voters in 2002 who were called and urged to "get out and vote" to the % of those same people who voted in 1998. This method shows a 17.9 percentage point increase. As the method gets more rigorous and controlled, that percentage point difference goes down although they are all "statistically significant" until you get to the "Randomized Evaluation" (the most rigorous method). The difference between voting in 2002 is only .04 percentage points higher than 1998 and it is NOT statistically significant.

Table 1: Comparing all six methods

Method	Estimated impact
Pre-Post	17.9 pp*
Simple Difference	10.8 pp*
Difference-in-Differences	1.9 pp*
Multivariate Regression with Panel Data	4.6 pp*
Matching (All Covariates)	2.8 pp*
Randomized Evaluation‡	0.4 pp

NOTES: pp means "percentage points" and * indicates statistically significant at the 5% level
‡ Randomized evaluation estimate is adjusted to reflect that only 25,000 of 60,000 in the treatment were treated (because they answered the phone call; 35,000 in the "treatment group" did not answer the phone)

Just wanted to share!1

Thanks,
AM

Angela D. Madden, Ph.D.
Research Associate Professor
Public Safety Institute

The University of Memphis
321 McCord Hall
Memphis, TN 38152

901.678.5923 | acrews1@memphis.edu